

LaRouche Tells Webcast How Mideast Peace Can Be Won

by Marla Minnicino

“The Middle East crisis is not a crisis of the Middle East; nor was it created in the Middle East; nor [by] protagonists in the Middle East,” Democratic Presidential pre-candidate Lyndon LaRouche told an audience of 200 people gathered in Washington, D.C., 50 more in New York City, and thousands more listening over the Internet to his live webcast on May 1. “This is a world crisis, which, for various strategic reasons, has exploded in the Middle East, threatens to spread out throughout that region, and threatens, under present circumstances, to bring an end, for generations to come, to civilization, worldwide, as we have known it. No crisis, including the wars of the last century, was as severe and dangerous to civilization as what you’re seeing *reflected* in the Middle East crisis, today.”

But peace is possible, LaRouche concluded, during a 75-minute *tour de force* and two and a half hours of dialogue—the key is the economic solution for which he has spent 25 years organizing, a solution which is in the interest of the United States, Europe, Israel, the Arab nations, and the rest of the globe.

Empire Idea Brings Clash of Civilizations

The candidate emphasized the problem that the United States doesn’t have a President who understands U.S. interests, but, he said, a political environment can be created based on the best aspects of the American System intellectual tradition which LaRouche represents today. The purpose of the American republic was not to dominate the world, but to create a community of principle among sovereign nation-states, as that idea was spelled out by John Quincy Adams. In the political environment LaRouche aims to create, even a President George W. Bush may take the necessary actions.

With broad historic sweep, LaRouche focussed on why

the Middle East has been a flashpoint for what are actually global instabilities. He began by outlining what has happened to the United States, beginning with the death of Franklin D. Roosevelt, to bring the utopian military faction around Henry Kissinger, Zbigniew Brzezinski, Samuel P. Huntington, et al. into power. This grouping has an objective of “perpetual war,” as part of their scheme for an Anglo-American world empire. It is the mortal enemy of the American Intellectual Tradition, which prioritizes concern for the general welfare of nations. No President has acted against this “imperial” policy cabal since 1964, with the brief exception of President Ronald Reagan’s adoption of the Strategic Defense Initiative.



Lyndon LaRouche, at his May 1 Washington international webcast, uses economic collapse-function charts to portray the underlying cause of the global crisis which is acting on the protagonists in the Middle East conflagration.

In the case of the Middle East, LaRouche insisted, “If the President of the United States would find the gumption and the wisdom to intervene in the Middle East, *this horror-show would stop immediately*. Not because the United States has the physical power to suppress what [Israeli Prime Minister Ariel] Sharon is doing, but because if the United States took that position, then the nations of Europe who want that result, would rally to, and cooperate with the United States; other parts of the world would rally to and cooperate with the United States; and the entire world, or most of it, would, as if with one crushing blow, *stop this murder in the Middle East now*, and bring about peace.”

As an example of how this has been done before, LaRouche referred to the positive example of President Eisenhower, who understood the American military tradition sufficiently to be willing to clamp down on Britain, Israel, and France during the Suez crisis.

To Stop a ‘Horror-Show’

LaRouche named the underlying source of the moral and political problem, as the world economic breakdown, involving the shift of the U.S. economy to a parasitical “consumer” society. He linked this with the degeneration represented by the spreading of the video-game “killer entertainment” phenomenon, which is creating a generation of potential killers like the schoolyard killer in Erfurt, Germany.

The Washington audience reacted strongly to a quick visual comparison of the Nazi crimes against the Jews of the

Warsaw Ghetto in 1943, and the IDF crimes on the West Bank, using graphic slides. LaRouche stressed that the United States was tolerating this, *not* because of the so-called Zionist Lobby, but because the same Anglo-American group behind the Clash of Civilizations faction here, controls the Sharon grouping in Israel.

To stop this “horror-show,” LaRouche said, “why don’t we work on the problem of trying to create around [Bush] an environment where it is communicated to him, that the United States does have an interest—he may not fully understand it, but make it clear to him what that interest is—the way it was clear, in a sense, to Eisenhower, the way it was clear to Johnson, in terms of the civil rights legislation. That something has to be done, because it’s in the interests of the United States.”

In the dialogue after his presentation, LaRouche took questions from the live audience—comprised of diplomats from more than a dozen countries, political officials and activists, students, and journalists—and written and phoned-in questions from the United States and abroad. Questions came from Egypt, Mexico, Canada, Australia, Russia, and many parts of the United States, from activists, policymakers, and ordinary citizens. Dozens more questions were received for LaRouche to review and answer later. In each answer, he pressed the issue of recognizing the truth and acting on it. In response to one, he said “just give me ten good men” who can have an impact on policy, to stand with me on these ideas, and we can win.

Peace Plan Requires Water, Reconstruction

Here is an excerpt from LaRouche’s speech:

Now, how is peace possible? Implicitly, it should be obvious. We have the power in the United States—and Europe is prepared to join the United States in such an effort, I can assure you; most of Europe, Italy, most of Germany, so forth, are willing to support the United States in such an effort—to say that we are going to bring an economic basis for durability of peace in the Middle East. That we’re going to do what was proposed earlier: two states, equally sovereign, side-by-side, living together in peace. Why? Because, first of all, you’ve got to provide the water, so that they can all have something to drink, to live; and there isn’t enough water. Some of the big impetus for war in the Middle East comes from a shortage of water in the aquifers. We’re capable of generating large-scale, efficient desalination programs which can produce water economically, for drinking and other human purposes. We can overcome

the water crisis of the Middle East.

The Middle East is, because of its position—as a point of traffic of Africa, through Eurasia, a crucial point of transport from the Mediterranean into the Indian Ocean—is an ideal place for the development of industries which are on the line of transportation. You can take the Sinai, you could take whole parts of the Middle East, and you could develop them as areas of industrial and related development. Very relevant, to the relationship not only to Africa, in general, but to the relationship of Europe as a producer of high-technology goods, into areas of Asia which desperately need infusions of high-technology goods. So there is no basis in either the interests of the people involved, or in the interests of Europe or the United States or Asia, to have this war go on. . . .

The purpose of war is not to kill; not justified war. The purpose is to bring about peace in the quickest possible way, for the most people. You want to bring about peace? We have the power to bring about peace in the Middle East, because we have not only the capability ourselves, but we have friends in Europe and elsewhere who would enthusiastically join with us in any program of reconstruction of the entire Middle East region.